

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 01 2006

REMARKS:

General

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-20 are pending in the application. Claim 5 has been canceled.

- Claim 5 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being improper. Claim 5 has been canceled in the present amendment.
- Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McGuyer (D509,114).
- Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arend et al.
- Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuyer in view of Stowell.
- Claims 4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuyer in view of Arend et al.
- Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuyer in view of Riley.
- Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuyer in view of Riley and further in view of Arend et al.

1. Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McGuyer (D509,114).

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations not disclosed in McGuyer. For example, claim 1 now includes the limitation of generally planar top surface extending along a length of the handle and adapted to engage a longitudinally extended index finger of a user, and a pair of side surfaces, each extending between the top surface and a bottom surface, wherein said side surfaces are wider than said top surface. As McGuyer does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, reconsideration of the rejection under 102(e) is requested.

2. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arend et al.

Claim 17 - 20 have been amended to include limitations of not disclosed in Arend et al. For example, claims 17-20 now includes the limitation of said handle further including a pair of generally planar side surfaces extending between said top surface and a bottom surface, said side

surfaces being wider than said top surface and being generally perpendicular to said top surface;
and placing a thumb finger tip against one of the pair of side surfaces.

As Arend et al. does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 17-20, reconsideration of the rejection under 102(b) is requested.

3. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuyer in view of Stowell et al.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to include limitations not disclosed in McGuyer or Stowell et al. For example, claims 2 and 3 now includes the limitation of generally planar top surface extending along a length of the handle and adapted to engage a longitudinally extended index finger of a user, and a pair of side surfaces, each extending between the top surface and a bottom surface, wherein said side surfaces are wider than said top surface. As a result, the combination of McGuyer and Arend et al., even if proper, would fail to yield the present invention. Reconsideration of the rejection under 103(a) is requested.

4. Claims 4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuyer in view of Arend et al.

Claims 4 and 6-10 have been amended to include limitations not disclosed in McGuyer or Arend et al. For example, claims 4, and 6-10 now includes the limitation of generally planar top surface extending along a length of the handle and adapted to engage a longitudinally extended index finger of a user, and a pair of side surfaces, each extending between the top surface and a bottom surface, wherein said side surfaces are wider than said top surface. As a result, the combination of McGuyer and Arend et al., even if proper, would fail to yield the present invention. Reconsideration of the rejection under 103(a) is requested.

5. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuyer in view of Riley.

Claims 12 and 13 have been amended to include limitations not disclosed in McGuyer or Riley. For example, claims 12 and 13 now includes the limitation of finger of a user, said handle having a pair of generally planar side surfaces and a generally planar bottom surface opposite said top surface, said

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 01 2006

side surfaces being wider than said top surface so that a cross-section of said handle is generally rectangular. As a result, the combination of McGuyer and Riley, even if proper, would fail to yield the present invention. Reconsideration of the rejection under 103(a) is requested.

6. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGuyer in view of Riley and further in view of Arend et al.

Claims 14 – 16 have been amended to include limitations not disclosed in McGuyer or Riley or Arend et al. For example, claims 14 – 16 now includes the limitation of finger of a user, said handle having a pair of generally planar side surfaces and a generally planar bottom surface opposite said top surface, said side surfaces being wider than said top surface so that a cross-section of said handle is generally rectangular. As a result, the combination of McGuyer and Riley and Arend et al., even if proper, would fail to yield the present invention. Reconsideration of the rejection under 103(a) is requested.

Conclusion

Fees associated with an extension of time to respond to an Office action in a timely manner may be charged to the deposit account of the undersigned, Dep. Acct # 50-1212 (ref. 10313984).

Should the Examiner wish to discuss these claims further, or should an Examiner's Amendment be needed in order for the claims to proceed to allowance, the Examiner is invited to direct any questions regarding this application to John Klos at (612) 321-2806.

Respectfully submitted,


John F. Klos
Registration No. 37,162
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
80 South Eighth Street, Suite 2100
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2112
Telephone: (612) 321-2800

Dated: November 1, 2006

25713659.1